

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Thorne (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,310) in view of Helstab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,031). Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of coupling a portable communications device (PCD) to a first network by way of a second network. As recited, the PCD is normally in radio communication with the first network, but is coupled to the first network by way of the second network when the PCD is out of radio communication with the first network. In the method, the PCD is coupled to the second network, and is caused to leave a first network mode and enter a second network mode. A network connection is established with the first network by way of the second network, and communication is entered into with the first network by way of the second network.

Independent claim 12 recites the method of claim 1, and further recites:

"placing the PCD into a cradle having a serial port connector and a network connector so that the serial port of the PCD is coupled with the serial port connector of the cradle;" and

"coupling the network connector of the cradle to the second network;".

As explained in the specification of the present application, the first network is typically a cellular or pager communications network. However, situations arise wherein the PCD is out of range of such pager or cellular communications network. In such an instance, the PCD is coupled to a second network such as a telephone or computer network, and communication is established with the pager or cellular communication network by way of the telephone or computer network.

The Thorne reference discloses a pager having a modem 48 coupled to a cellular receiver 50 and a cellular transmitter 54 for over-air communication with a cellular network. The modem 48 is also coupled to a telephone jack 34 on the pager for communication with a telephone line which is presumably coupled to a telephone network. However, and importantly, the Thorne reference does not disclose or suggest that the telephone network (i.e., the second network) is coupled to the cellular network (i.e., the first network) such that the pager is coupled to the cellular network by way of the telephone network when the pager is out of radio communication with the cellular network, as is required by independent claims 1 and 12. As a result, and as the Examiner concedes, the Thorne reference also does not disclose or suggest establishing a network connection with a first network by way of a second network, and entering into communication with the first network by way of the second network, as is required by claims 1 and 12.

The Helstab reference is directed to a base unit for a wireless telephone. When a wireless handset is docked with the base unit, the base unit connects to the wireless (cellular) network via the handset's wireless interface, enabling "the user to receive or make calls from the base unit 114 via the wireless handset's communication protocol." (See Helstab, column 4, lines 22-24). Here, there

is no second network, as is required by claims 1 and 12, and thus, like the Thorne reference, the Helstab reference does not disclose or suggest establishing a network connection with a first network by way of a second network and entering into communication with the first network by way of the second network, as is required by claims 1 and 12.

More importantly, since both the Thorne and Helstab references fail to disclose or suggest establishing a network connection with a first network by way of a second network and entering into communication with the first network by way of the second network when direct radio communication with the first network is not available, as is required by claims 1 and 12, such references cannot be applied to make obvious claim 1 or claim 12 or any claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-11 and 13-20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection as it may be applied to claims 1-20.

In view of the foregoing amendment and discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-20 is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Murphy
Susan Murphy
Registration No. 46,221

Date: *August 7, 2001*

WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ
MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 568-3100